

REMARKS

In accordance with Applicants' duty to provide a summary of the substance of an interview, Applicants submit that Applicants' representative participated in a telephone interview with Examiner Sol on October 25, 2007. Applicants would like to thank Examiner Sol for the courtesies extended during that interview. During the interview, Applicants' representative presented arguments as to why the claims, as presented herein, differ from the applied references. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejections set forth in the non-final Office Action when presented in this Amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 8-14, 20, 22, 25-29, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Rao (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0139174); rejected claims 2 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Rao in view of Hochmuth et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055968); and rejected claims 4-7, 15-17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Rao in view of Chandrashekhar et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220872).

By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 3-7, 13-15, 17, 19, 25, 30, and 32 without prejudice or disclaimer, amend claims 1, 2, 8-12, 16, 18, 20-24, 26, and 31 to improve form, and add new claims 33-35. Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 with regard to the claims as presented herein. Claims 1, 2, 8-12, 16, 18, 20-24, 26-29, 31, and 33-35 are pending.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 BASED ON RAO

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1, 8-12, 20, 22, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as allegedly anticipated by Rao. Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Claims 1 and 8-12 have been amended to depend from claim 23, and claims 20 and 22 have been amended to depend from claim 31. Claims 23 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over a combination of Rao and Chandrashekhar et al. (paragraph 5). Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 8-12, 20, and 22 as anticipated by Rao is rendered moot. Applicants submit that claims 1, 8-12, 20, and 22 are patentable over Rao and Chandrashekhar et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given below with regard to claims 23 and 31.

Amended independent claim 26 is directed to a wholesaler system that provides services to subscribers associated with a plurality of retailer systems. The wholesaler system comprises a service activation component configured to provide the services to the subscribers; and a service gateway configured to act as a single point of contact between the retailer systems and the service activation component, where the service gateway provides controlled access, by the retailer systems, to the services provided by the service activation component, and the service gateway permits each of the retailer systems access to a subset of the services provided by the service activation component via the controlled access. The service gateway comprises a first interface module to receive, from one of the retailer systems, a message requesting performance of one of the services by the service activation component, where the message includes at least one argument that includes data useful for performing the one service; an access control module to make a first determination of whether the one retailer system is permitted to request

performance of the one service, make a second determination of whether the at least one argument is permissible for the one retailer system, and make a third determination of whether the at least one argument is valid for the one service; and a second interface module to selectively interact with the service activation component based, at least in part, on the first, second, and third determinations of the access control module.

Rao does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in amended claim 26. For example, Rao does not disclose or suggest a service gateway that comprises, among other things, an access control module to make a first determination of whether the one retailer system is permitted to request performance of the one service, make a second determination of whether the at least one argument is permissible for the one retailer system, and make a third determination of whether the at least one argument is valid for the one service, as recited in claim 26.

Instead, Rao simply discloses using user profiles and single log-in capability to permit customized access to services and applications via a common service platform (CSP) (paragraph 0038). For example, Rao discloses requiring a user ID or password to authenticate end users before permitting them access to the CSP (paragraph 0085). This authentication performed by Rao cannot reasonably be equated to a first determination of whether a retailer system is permitted to request performance of a service, a second determination of whether at least one argument is permissible for the retailer system, or a third determination of whether the at least one argument is valid for the service. Thus Rao does not disclose or suggest a service gateway that comprises, among other things, an access control module to make a first determination of whether the one retailer system is permitted to request performance of the one service, make a

second determination of whether the at least one argument is permissible for the one retailer system, and make a third determination of whether the at least one argument is valid for the one service, as recited in claim 26.

Because Rao does not disclose or suggest a service gateway that comprises an access control module to make a first determination of whether the one retailer system is permitted to request performance of the one service, make a second determination of whether the at least one argument is permissible for the one retailer system, and make a third determination of whether the at least one argument is valid for the one service, Rao cannot disclose or suggest a service gateway that further comprises a second interface module to selectively interact with a service activation component based, at least in part, on the first, second, and third determinations of the access control module, as further recited in claim 26.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 26 is not anticipated by Rao. Claims 27-29 depend from claim 26 and are, therefore, not anticipated by Rao for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 26.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 8-12, 20, 22, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Rao.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON RAO AND HOCHMUTH ET AL.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao in view of Hochmuth et al. Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 23, and claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 31. Claims 23 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over a combination of Rao and Chandrashekhar et al. (paragraph 5). Therefore, the rejection of claims 2 and 18 based on Rao and Hochmuth et al. is rendered moot. Applicants submit that the disclosure of Hochmuth et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of Rao and Chandrashekhar et al. identified below with regard to claims 23 and 31.

Therefore, claims 2 and 18 are patentable over Rao, Chandrashekhar et al., and Hochmuth et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given below with regard to claims 23 and 31.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao and Hochmuth et al., or Rao, Chandrashekhar et al., and Hochmuth et al.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON RAO AND CHANDRASHEKHAR ET AL.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 16, 21, 23, 24, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao in view of Chandrashekhar et al. Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Amended independent claim 23 is directed to a system that comprises a service gateway in communication with a first entity and a second entity. The service gateway comprises a first interface module to receive, from the first entity, a message requesting performance of a service in an extensible set of services offered by the second entity, the message including a service name that corresponds to the service and an argument that includes data useful in performing the service; an access control module to make a first determination of whether the first entity is

permitted to request performance of the service corresponding to the service name, make a second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and make a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service corresponding to the service name; and a second interface module to selectively request performance of the service by the second entity based, at least in part, on results of the first, second, and third determinations of the access control module.

Rao and Chandrashekar et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in amended claim 23. For example, Rao and Chandrashekar et al. do not disclose or suggest a service gateway that includes, for example, an access control module to make a first determination of whether a first entity is permitted to request performance of the service corresponding to the service name, make a second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and make a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service corresponding to the service name.

The Examiner alleged that Rao generally discloses these features and cited paragraphs 0085 and 0060 of Rao for support (Office Action, page 11). Applicants submit that the disclosure of Rao does not support the Examiner's allegation.

At paragraph 0085, Rao discloses:

For authentication, a user ID or password (such as one having a minimum length) will be required for authenticating Internet end users for accessing the common service platform or CSP according to the invention. Subscriber identity module or SIM cards are used for authenticating mobile CSP users. A session expiration or timeout after a certain time period is also available. For access control, the CSP system according to the invention allows administration of access rules within a plurality of applications, and supports multiple user classes or groups, each having access to different functionalities and data. The CSP system can further include the capability to customize access for each user, e.g.,

by overriding the group access protocols. For network administration, the CSP according to the invention utilizes the concept of data zones for its systems. Exemplary data zones includes a red zones where systems are completely untrusted, such as any system on external networks, a yellow zone having somewhat trusted systems generally including systems that communicate externally, and a green zone having trusted systems generally including internal core-business systems. Firewalls stand on zone boundaries. No persistent application data (as identified in terms of data sensitivity) will be stored on yellow or red zone systems, except session data. There are generally no connections between red and green zone systems. Firewall rules ensure that only authorized yellow zone hosts can contact green zone hosts.

In this section, Rao discloses that a user ID or password is used to authenticate Internet end users for accessing the common service platform (CSP), and that the CSP can customize access for each user. This user authentication, or even the customized access, cannot reasonably be equated to a first determination of whether a first entity is permitted to request performance of a service, a second determination of whether an argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service. Thus, Rao does not disclose or suggest a service gateway that includes, for example, an access control module to make a first determination of whether a first entity is permitted to request performance of the service corresponding to the service name, make a second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and make a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service corresponding to the service name, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 0060, Rao discloses:

Personalization services will maintain and provide information for different users. Profile services can also be extended to provide services for holding permissible client preferences. Web page presentation for different end users or client devices can accordingly be generated based on the personalization information.

In this section, Rao discloses personalization services that maintain and provide information for different users. These personalization services cannot reasonably be equated to a first

determination of whether a first entity is permitted to request performance of a service, a second determination of whether an argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service. Thus, Rao does not disclose or suggest a service gateway that includes, for example, an access control module to make a first determination of whether a first entity is permitted to request performance of the service corresponding to the service name, make a second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and make a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service corresponding to the service name, as recited in claim 23.

Chandrashekhar et al. also does not disclose or suggest these features of claim 23. Instead, Chandrashekhar et al. discloses using authentication or login information from an end user to authenticate the end user and, if the end user is properly authenticated, the system provides the end user with a customized list of services and applications to which the end user has subscribed (paragraph 0030). Nowhere does Chandrashekhar et al. disclose or suggest any of the three determinations recited in claim 23. Thus, Chandrashekhar et al. does not disclose or suggest a service gateway that includes, for example, an access control module to make a first determination of whether a first entity is permitted to request performance of the service corresponding to the service name, make a second determination of whether the argument is permitted to be provided by the first entity, and make a third determination of whether the argument is permitted to be requested for the service corresponding to the service name, as recited in claim 23.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 23 is patentable over Rao and Chandrashekhhar et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is, therefore, patentable over Rao and Chandrashekhhar et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 23.

Amended independent claim 31 recites features similar to, yet possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 23. Claim 31 is, therefore, patentable over Rao and Chandrashekhhar et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 23. Claims 16 and 21 depend from claim 31 and are, therefore, patentable over Rao and Chandrashekhhar et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 31.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16, 21, 23, 24, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao and Chandrashekhhar et al.

NEW CLAIMS

New claim 33 depends from claim 23, and new claim 34 depends from claim 31. Claims 33 and 34 are, therefore, patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons given with regard to claims 23 and 31.

New independent claim 35 recites features similar to, yet possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 23. Claim 35 is, therefore, patentable over the applied references, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 23.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of pending claims 1, 2, 8-12, 16, 18, 20-24, 26-29, 31, and 33-35.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

/Paul A. Harrity, Reg. No. 39,574/
Paul A. Harrity
Reg. No. 39,574

Date: October 30, 2007
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800